

**Remarks:**

By the above amendment, Applicants have rewritten all claims to define the invention more particularly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentability over the prior art.

The following remarks address the office action's specific objections, by their number.

1. Response to Amendment verifying cancelation and addition of claims. No action was requested.
2. Quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a). No action was requested.
3. Claims 16-22 were rejected as being unpatentable over the personal computer game, "Final Fantasy VIII" and "Super Mario 64". Claims have been dropped or revised and narrowed to separate the invention from prior art, including the references cited.

Regarding objections to claim 16; claim 16 has been amended by claim 23. The action's objection is based on nouns found in "FF VIII"s control mechanism. However, the nouns referenced are, in fact, short forms for verb based commands given to a character avatar. The 'item' and 'magic' nouns referenced stand in for the verbs 'use' and 'cast'. 'Use' and 'cast' are verb commands to be enacted by an intermediary agent. Prior art is not demonstrated by the objection.

Regarding objections to claim 17; claim 17 has been amended by claim 24. The action's objection is based upon the objection to claim 16. As prior art was not demonstrated in the objection to 16, this subordinate claim remains valid.

Regarding objections to claim 18; claim 18 has been amended by claim 25. The action's objection is based upon the objection to claim 16. As prior art was not demonstrated in the objection to 16, this subordinate claim remains valid.

Regarding objections to claim 19; claim 19 has been amended by claim 26. The action's objection observes that this claim allows actions similar to prior art, specifically the example of allowing a player to control a game character during a fight. As one purpose of this invention is to eliminate control of an avatar, working in the invention's paradigm requires thinking contrary to prior art. Therefore a method to reintroduce prior art in the new paradigm becomes beneficial. Without this subordinate method, integrating prior art control mechanisms may interfere with the advantages offered by the main method proposed.

Regarding objections to claim 20; claim 20 has been amended by claim 27. The action's objection discusses the receipt of items as a result of winning a battle and its similarity to prior art. Claim 27 describes story neutral behavior of characters in the environment, behavior expressed while the player is still deciding which noun to introduce next. Claim 27 does not describe the objection's example.

## Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now to proper form, and that the claims all define patentability over the prior art. Therefore he submits that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action he respectfully solicits.

## Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

Applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.

Very respectfully,

Keith G. Nemitz, Applicant

4329 Salem St.  
Emeryville, CA 94608  
Tel. (510) 652-3197

**Certificate of Mailing:** I certify that on the date below this document and referenced attachments, if any, will be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450."

2007 May 21

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Keith Nemitz, Applicant